



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

arms, 12,000 artillery wagons, and 70,000 horses. These objects are valued at 250,000,000 francs. This, however, is not all. During a space of thirteen years, from 1801 to 1813, the increase of the national debt leaves, according to the official return, a deficit of 1,645,469,000 francs.

Behold the consequences of ten years' war, of which Waterloo was the finale. Three millions of soldiers, 2,000,000,000 of debt, the agriculture, manufactures, and trade of France sacrificed to a false point of honor, more military than national; has all that, we ask, rendered France more glorious and powerful? Who will dare reply in the affirmative, in presence of the treaties of 1815? Taught by a fatal experience, we must not suffer ourselves to be led astray by empty words. The honor of a nation rests in the power it possesses and exercises. The power of governments now resides less in the force of their armies than in the organization of their credit, and the extent of their commerce.

What a picture of horror does the following paragraph from the London Times present! What blood spilt! What money expended to enable man to butcher his fellow-man! "Since the year 1000 there have been 24 different wars between England and France, 12 between England and Scotland, 8 between England and Spain, and 7 with other countries,—in all 51 wars! There have been six wars within 100 years, viz.: 1st war, ending 1697, cost 21,500,000*l.* 100,000 slain, 80,000 died of famine.—2d war, began 1702, cost 43,000,000*l.* Slain not ascertained.—3d war, began 1739, cost 48,000,000*l.* Slain not ascertained.—4th war, began 1756, cost 111,000,000*l.* Slain 250,000.—5th, American war, began 1775, cost 139,000,000*l.* Slain 200,000.—6th, last war, began 1793, cost 750,000,000*l.* Slain 2,000,000 amongst all the belligerents. At the conclusion of the war which ended in 1697, the national debt was 21,500,000*l.*; but in 1815, it amounted to no less than 1,050,000,000*l.* OR NEARLY FIVE THOUSAND MILLIONS OF DOLLARS."

ARTICLE VIII.

LITERARY NOTICES.

1. *Defensive War. A Letter to WILLIAM LADD, Esq., President of the American Peace Society.* By WILLIAM ALLEN, D. D., *President of Bowdoin College.*

Dr. Allen assigns the following reasons for dissenting from the principle, that *all* war is contrary to the spirit of the gospel, and for believing *defensive* war to be in harmony with it: 1. The former principle "will prove an insuperable obstacle to any great results from our society;" because "the statesmen who govern the world, must look upon it as a dream of weak benevolence!" "Have any of the rulers believed on him?"—2. "It is not supported by the voice of the church in any age." Not since her first degeneracy; but it was *before*, as we believe, and shall endeavor in due time to prove.—

3. "It is founded on a misconstruction of some of the precepts of Christ." A position without proof; while *we* maintain that the writer's theory is not only a misconstruction, but a direct contradiction of nearly *all* that the gospel contains on this subject.—4. "It contradicts the plainest and most decisive instructions of the gospel." Only a single passage quoted in proof, and that relating not to the subject of war, but to the duty of obeying magistrates, and their power over *their own subjects*, not over those of another government. Rom. 13.—5. "God has authorized and commanded wars;" thus proving that all war is not contrary to the spirit of the *gospel*! very much as the sacrifice of Isaac may be supposed to justify murder, and the example of patriarchs to sanction polygamy and concubinage.

We should have been glad, if our pages had not been preoccupied, to insert this letter without delay; but, as it has appeared in the newspapers too recently to receive as yet any notice from Mr. Ladd through the same medium, it might be deemed premature in us to take any further notice of it at present, except to give the foregoing abstract, to commend its Christian spirit, and intimate our purpose of taking it up in a future number.

1. We cannot, however, refrain from expressing our regret that Dr. Allen should seem, in the first place, to *mistake the real point in controversy*. The question is not whether human life is strictly inviolable; not whether capital punishments are lawful; not whether government may enforce its laws upon its own subjects, and put down mobs by the sword of the magistrate; but simply *whether the GOSPEL allows one NATION to war against another under any circumstances*. This point Dr. Allen touches but lightly, and spends nearly all his strength upon the others, about which *we* have no controversy with him, because they form no part of the peace cause. Correct this misconception and the letter is well nigh powerless.

2. Dr. Allen *does not, in our view, appeal to the gospel as the only judge in this matter, but relies for the success of his argument far more on popular misconception, prejudice and passion*. Here lies nearly all the force of his letter; but the point in dispute can be settled to entire satisfaction *only* in the light of the *gospel*. We inquire not what statesmen think, nor what was allowed under a dispensation confessedly imperfect, nor what public opinion formed under the war-influences of sixty centuries will approve and applaud; but what the New Testament teaches by a right construction of its precepts.

3. Our Society is charged with adopting its fundamental principle from complaisance to "the radicalism of the age." The charge is as groundless as it is ungenerous.

4. Dr. Allen apparently supposes, that the friends of peace, while differing in their views concerning wars strictly defensive, cannot coöperate under the same organization in accomplishing a common object. Such a coöperation we have long hoped to see; but, while Dr. Allen starts back from us because we go too far, others still keep aloof from us because we do not go far enough. Will our friends on each side tell us what to do? Or will they *never* learn the candor, forbearance and wisdom indispensable to the success of such an enterprise as this? Shall we spend all our energies in contention among ourselves, and thus expose our cause to reproach and failure?